

## REMARKS

Claims 8 and 11-14 are pending in the application. Claim 8 is amended for clarity and claims 9 and 10 are canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added. In view of the comments that follow, favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

The Office action objects to the Abstract of the disclosure. The Abstract is replaced with a corrected Abstract.

The Office action asserts that claims 9 and 10 are substantial duplicates of claims 12-14. Claims 9 and 10 having been canceled, this potential problem is obviated.

The Office action rejects claims 8-10 and 12-14 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. Claim 8 is amended for clarity to comply with 35 USC § 112. Withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office action rejects claims 8-14 under 35 USC § 102(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,703,761 to Heiss. This rejection is moot as to canceled claims 9 and 10. Applicants otherwise respectfully traverse this rejection. As explained below, claims 8 and 11-14 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 8 and 12-14 are patentable over Heiss for at least the reason that Heiss does not teach or suggest the recited synthetic resin capping layer exhibiting a continuous mechanical property variation in a direction at right angles to its surface. Conversely, Heiss teaches a thin non-conductive layer 7 made e.g.

of silicon rubber or lacquer (column 2, lines 33-36). Heiss discloses neither synthetic resin nor mechanical property variation within this non-conductive layer 7, let alone the recited continuous mechanical property variation at right angles to its surface.

Independent claim 11 is patentable over Heiss for at least the reason that Heiss does not teach or suggest the recited synthetic resin capping layer which constitutes the housing of the mobile telephone. The non-conductive layer 7 of Heiss does not constitute the housing of the mobile telephone. Conversely, Heiss teaches a metallized conductive surface 6 that covers the non-conductive layer 7.

Since the cited reference does not disclose all the recited elements of any of claims 8 and 11-14, the § 102(a) rejection of claims 8 and 11-14 should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the present application to be in condition for allowance.

If any points remain in issue that the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By *Eric M. Bram*  
Eric M. Bram, Reg. 37,285  
Patent Attorney  
(914) 333-9635  
October 13, 2000



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

On *October 13, 2000*  
(Date of Mailing)

By *Natalia A. Manzo*  
(Signature)